



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The nations shall learn war no more.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Mail Matter.

"The United States and Great Britain are the two great foreign missionary countries of the world. Of the 1,157,668 communicants in foreign mission churches Great Britain has 312,297, and the United States 397,252; of the 11,574 male and female foreign missionaries Great Britain has 5,229, the United States 3,512; of the 70,033 native laborers Great Britain has 38,874, the United States 14,766; of the \$14,441,807 contributed to foreign missions last year Great Britain gave \$7,337,275, the United States \$5,006,809; of the 5,055 principal foreign mission stations Great Britain has 3,408, the United States 993; of the 17,813 out-stations Great Britain has 12,084, the United States 4,911. We do not believe that the Lord will permit these two great leaders in the work of converting the world to Christ, to engage in war with each other. Let Christians continue to pray that such an awful issue may be prevented."

The Carter bill introduced into the United States Senate on December 19, 1895, "to establish a bureau of military education and to promote the adoption of uniform military drill in the public schools of the several States and Territories," which is now before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, ought to be so condemned by the public sentiment of the country as to leave it not the least chance of being adopted. Its purposes are contrary to all the highest and best interests of the country, physical, intellectual and moral.

A PLEA FOR PEACE.

BY REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.

From a sermon preached in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, December, 22, 1895.

Last Tuesday morning this Nation was at peace with itself and with all the world, and was gradually recovering from a shock of commercial disaster which had for a time paralysed our industries and impaired our financial prosperity. Wednesday morning the whole Nation was aflame, from ocean to ocean, with passionate fire — apprehension, wrath, exultation; and the cause of the difference between Tuesday morning and Wednesday morning was a message of the President of the United States. * * *

What is the issue which has arisen which has inflamed the passions of this people, which has already weakened the ties that bind us to the mother country, which has already imperiled prosperity and impoverished some?

In 1845, fifty years ago, the Republic of Venezuela had its independence acknowledged by Spain, of which it was formerly a dependency, and with which it had been in conflict for a considerable number of years preceding. This Venezuela is one of the Spanish-American Republics, so-called. It has a constitution on paper something like ours. But during the fifty years of its existence it has been, the major part of the time, either in revolution or under a military dictator. It is, in its complexion and character, a republic only in name.

Its established religion is that of the Roman Catholic church. But not of the Roman Catholic church as we see it in America; not of the Roman Catholic church of Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons; not even of the Roman Catholic church of Archbishop Corrigan; not the Roman Catholic church even of Ireland or of France; nor yet of Spain. It is a church made up partly of old-time barbarism, and partly of an imperfect Christianity; absolutely reactionary.

This is Venezuela.

Bordering it is an English colony, which has been an English colony since 1814. It has the attributes and qualities of most English colonies — at least, a good degree of independence and business enterprise. There is a longtime dispute as to the boundary between these two countries. Venezuela and Colombia, on one side, are in dispute as to their boundaries. Venezuela and British Guiana are in dispute, on the other side, as to their boundaries.

The land where this disputed boundary line lies is little inhabited; indeed, but little known. I am told, on what I think to be very good commercial authority, that the people of the United States have already lost in the commercial distress which has followed the mere threat of war — the mere shadow of a shadow — for it is nothing more than that as yet — the people of the United States have already lost in depreciation of properties more than twice as much as would suffice to buy the whole of the disputed territory and give it to either party as a Christmas present. (Laughter.)

This disputed boundary line has long been in discussion. We have proposed to England to arbitrate the entire question. England ought to arbitrate the entire question. She does wrong in refusing. She consents to arbitrate up to a certain point; beyond that she refuses to arbitrate. And then what do we propose? * * * *

This government proposes to say to the governments of Europe, "Hereafter we will assume the function of a supreme international court as regards all contests in South America. We will be judge, jury and sheriff. You shall do what we say is right. If you do not do what we say is right, we will make you do it." It is a pretty large contract even for a pretty large country. But that is no matter. The question is, is it right? That is the only question I have to do with to-night. I do not discuss the question whether we can; I only discuss the question whether we ought to.

There are four grounds on which it is claimed we ought to assume this governmental jurisdiction over South America: first, our commercial interest; secondly, our duty to an oppressed sister republic; thirdly, our traditions as expressed in the Monroe doctrine; and fourthly,

that Great Britain is a great deal of a bully, and it is time she had a thrashing. (Laughter.) I propose to take up these four questions and consider them separately. * * *

First, it is claimed that we ought to undertake this police and judicial function in respect to South America, because our commercial interests are imperiled, because if Great Britain gets a strip of territory, variously estimated at from 33,000 square miles to 300,000 square miles, our National welfare will be imperiled. * * *

It is difficult for me to take this seriously. If Great Britain, in a disputed question of territory 2,500 miles away from us, gets 33,000 or 300,000 square miles, our peaceful prosperity is at an end and we must arm and equip ourselves for perpetual warfare; and all this time Great Britain has almost as much territory on this continent as we have. Her border line runs contiguous to our border line, from Penobscot Bay to Vancouver Island, and yet we must have a standing army, fleets and navies if she gets 300,000 square miles 2,500 miles away from us in South America! For all these years we have had this border line, and by the simple expedient of a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, made at the close of the War of 1812, there is not a naval vessel on the lakes, there is not a torpedo boat and there is not a fortress from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and yet, forsooth, we must take on all the standing armies of Europe, lest she get a base of operations 2,500 miles from us! Our commercial interests imperiled! I wish to treat State documents with becoming respect. That is, *becoming* respect. (Laughter.)

But consider for one moment what this means. If we were a weak nation, if it were a question of our future, if we barely had our foothold on this continent surrounded by hostile forces, if we were growing weaker, then we might, perhaps, say, "We will not allow a square foot of territory to be added of colonial possessions; we will stop it right here." But we are sixty millions of people; we have grown with an unparalleled growth, in resources, in wealth, in population, in might; another hundred years of peace will make the American Nation the greatest and the most potent Empire on the face of the globe; and yet, lest our commercial interests shall be imperiled by a possible conflict in the future, we are to insist that it shall take place now. Lest by and by England shall assail us from a base of operations 2,500 miles away, we are to ask her now to enter into this horrible duel, with our seaports unprotected from Bangor to Galveston. We are to invite her fleets to come. We are to patrol the whole border, from Atlantic to Pacific. We are to stop the running of the trains of the great railroads that cross the isthmus of Canada, from New York to Chicago. We are practically to isolate Detroit. And we are to do all this now, lest possibly in some future time, from a far-away base of operations, military enterprises may be undertaken against us.

The truth is, so far as self-interest is concerned, we might well wish that England would absorb the whole of Venezuela, and then go on absorbing more and more; for these Spanish-American republics, with the exception of Brazil, have done nothing for civilization, and England has done much for civilization wherever she has gone. The English colony would carry with it the railroad, the telegraph, the banking system, manufactures, schools, churches, civilization. The richer South America is, the more prosperous, the more built-up in all modern appliances and life, the richer, the better, the more prosperous

we should be. I know that there is a philosophy that scoffs at this, that thinks the welfare of one nation depends upon the poverty of another. It belongs to the old time notion that the wealth of one man depended on the poverty of another. Every nation's wealth adds to every other nation's wealth, and there is no rivalry in commerce that is righteous that is not helpful to both rivals. * * *

No, we do not, any of us, seriously believe our national peace, or our national welfare, or our national prosperity, will be put in peril by running the border line between Venezuela and British Guiana, a few miles on the one side or a few miles on the other. That is not the real reason of our excitement.

Is it, then, our duty? "Here is a republic, poor, feeble, unable to cope with so great an adversary, and she is being ground under the heel of a despot. Therefore, we ought to go to her defense." Whether England or Venezuela is right on this boundary question, I do not know. Therefore I do not undertake to determine. Looking at the history of the past and taking all that we know into consideration, it is not probable that Great Britain is wholly wrong, and it is almost certain she is not wholly right. Nations have a way of claiming more than they are entitled to in order to get what they are entitled to, and England has not been guilty of much modesty in this regard in times past; and, as I said before, I think she is wholly wrong in refusing to arbitrate the question, and the whole question, and in all the aspects of it. Never ought war to be resorted to when arbitration is possible. But the question for us to determine is not, Is England right or wrong? but, Are we appointed to make her do what we think is right? Are we to undertake to police the whole of South America? Are we to act as a supreme and final court of jurisdiction in all South American disputes? If we are to settle the boundary line between British Guiana and Venezuela, why not between Venezuela and Colombia? If between British Guiana and Venezuela, why not between French Guiana and Brazil? If we are to compel one community to do right, reason will require us to compel another. It can only be on the ground that we take these South American republics under our wing and make them our wards. If we are to compel all Powers to treat them righteously, we must compel them to treat all Powers righteously. And that is a very large undertaking. Consider what the South American so-called republics are. This is the question which addresses itself to us, Is it our duty? — nay, Have we a right to do it? Consider for one moment. If two merchants get into a quarrel over a piece of property five thousand dollars in value, they go to one judge, from that judge to a bench of three judges; and from that bench of three judges to a Court of Appeals; and, perhaps from that Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, before the question is finally settled. And they have had a share in determining who those judges shall be. The President proposes that we shall ourselves constitute a court, a court without any appeal whatever. When this commission has gone down, and has come back with its story and told what it thinks is right, we accept that report, unless we all go down there to revise it. Then we are to make that final. And in an issue involving not thousands of dollars but millions, not interests of two men but the lives and property and well-being of thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and the prosperity of two great nations — that, that is all

to depend on one court, appointed by one man, and from its judgment there is to be no appeal whatever, and the parties to the controversy are to have no word whatever in selecting the tribunal. * * *

No! it is not our self-interest; and it is not our passionate sense of duty which has excited us. It is something else. Is it the "Monroe Doctrine"? Are we required by the Monroe Doctrine to carry out this policy? What is the "Monroe Doctrine"? It is comprised, primarily, in a single paragraph in a message of a President of the United States. It has neither legal nor constitutional binding force in the country. It is just so far binding on us as we count it wise and applicable to our time. But let that pass. What is the Monroe Doctrine? At the close of the Napoleonic wars a great reaction in the interest of despotism set in. That most unholy combination, styled euphemistically in history, the "Holy Alliance," was formed, by which three great despotic Powers of Europe — Russia, Austria and Prussia — joined by most of the other European powers, united in a common purpose to restore the despotisms which the Napoleonic wars had broken up. They put down risings in different parts of Europe, and then they proposed to cross the sea and re-establish Spanish authority in the American hemisphere; and then it was that England proposed the Monroe Doctrine. For the Monroe Doctrine originated with an English statesman and was proposed by him to America. Mr. Canning, then Prime Minister of England, suggested to our country that it was fitting and proper that we should lay down the rule that there should be no forcible overrunning of American territory by foreign Powers in the interest of European despotism. Mr. Monroe submitted the question raised to Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison: and I read first what Thomas Jefferson says:

"America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe and peculiarly her own. She should, therefore, have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit. She now offers to lend aid and accompany us in it. By acceding to her propositions we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government and emancipate a continent at one stroke. * * * Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any one of all on earth, and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause."

That is one clause of the Monroe doctrine which I respectfully submit to some of the newspaper warriors. With England "we should sedulously cherish a cordial friendship." Mr. Madison's opinion concurred with Jefferson's; and Mr. Monroe submitted in his message the doctrine which he believed should govern the United States in the future, and these were the terms of his recommendation. As I read it I ask you to note, incidentally, the difference in spirit between this message and the somewhat bellicose papers that we have been reading for the last few days, emanating from the President and his Secretary.

"We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but

with the Governments which have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great considerations and just principles, acknowledged, we could not view an interposition for oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. * * * The American continents should no longer be subjects for any new European colonial settlement."

But even that went beyond what Congress was willing to do; and in 1823, the House of Representatives made its declaration on this subject, and here it is:

"The United States ought not to become a party with Spanish-American republics or either of them, to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing interference by any of the European powers with their independence or form of government, or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continents of America; but the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such a manner as their feelings of friendship towards those republics and as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate."

This is the interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine by the House of Representatives of the United States after the matter had been under advisement for two years. A year later it has received an official interpretation from Daniel Webster, and with that I will close my reading of the history of that time.

"It is doubtless true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that this declaration must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation. It did not commit us, at all events, to take up arms on any indication of hostile feeling by the Powers of Europe towards South America. If, for example, all the States of Europe had refused to trade with South America until her States should return to their former allegiance, that would have furnished no cause of interference to us. Or, if an armament had been furnished by the allies to act against provinces the most remote from us, as Chile or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action diminishing our apprehension of danger, and diminishing also our means of effectual interposition, might still have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance. But a different case would have arisen if an army, equipped and maintained by these Powers, had been landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and commenced the war in our own immediate neighborhood. Such an event might justly be regarded as dangerous to ourselves, and, on that ground, call for decided and immediate interference by us. The sentiments and the policy announced by the declaration, thus understood, were therefore in strict conformity to our duties and our interests."

What then, in the line of this declaration of Monroe, this act of the House of Representatives, this interpretation by Jefferson before, and by Daniel Webster after — what is the Monroe Doctrine? Consider the time. The war of the Revolution is still in the near past. The war of 1812 has but just passed away. Napoleonic wars are over. Despotism is resuming its sway in Europe. The Bourbons are re-established in their throne. They are stretching out their hands and seeking to re-establish despotisms on this continent. We are a weak and feeble Nation; and we declare it a matter of friendliness and candor to tell the powers of Europe that any attempt on their part to oppress the free republics already organized, whose freedom and nationality we have recognized, to sweep them away and re-establish the feudal despotism of the old world on this continent, we shall regard as an unfriendly act. And then Congress goes on to say: Yes, that may be true; but still we shall judge each case on its own merits. And then Daniel Webster goes on to add to that: "Yes, and if it is at a remote point, it will be only a ground for protest; if it is close at hand, then it will be ground for action."

Now what has happened? The despotisms of the Old

World are, for the most part, defunct. France is a declared republic. Germany is more than half republican. Italy is truly republican. Spain and Russia are the only Old World despotisms, and even they are not the Old World despotisms they once were; while this country is strong and rich, and growing stronger and richer every year. The danger which called for the Monroe Doctrine has somewhat drifted into the past. The old feudalism is dead in the Old World. It will not replant itself in the New. No one fears it.

And now a question of border line has arisen between what is called a republic, but which has been in perpetual turmoil ever since it existed, and a nation as truly democratic as our own in everything but name—between a republic that is republic only in name and a nation that is republic in everything but name; and the Monroe Doctrine is called upon to compel us to interfere. It has absolutely no relation whatever to the subject. The question whether it is our duty, the question whether we ought to interfere, is to be determined wholly and absolutely without relation to the closed page of the past. * * *

No, it is not because our self-interest calls us; it is not because our duty demands it; it is not because our traditions beckon us to war—it is for two other reasons. There has grown up in this country a great hostility to the mother country. And not wholly without reason. She wronged us in the Colonial days. She wronged us in 1812. She threatened us with wrong, if she did not perpetrate it in our own Civil War. And in these latter months we have been impatient and righteously impatient with her inaction while the massacres of unoffending Christians go on in a land which she has bolstered up. There is reason for our prejudices against Great Britain. But Great Britain is two nations, as almost every man is two men. She is not all sinner, and she certainly is not all saint. Neither are we, for that matter. She illustrates the seventh chapter of Romans. She is an upper-man and a lower man—a good nation and a bad nation. Wherever she has gone, she has gone brusque and bold and defiant, with lack of tact, and sometimes, perhaps often, with lack of legitimate and proper self-restraint. She has put her hand on India and on Egypt, and on the arsenals and depots of the Mediterranean, and on the American continent, but wherever she has gone she has carried a higher life with her; no nation has been worse for her presence.

India is immeasurably better off to-day than before England planted colonies there. Egypt is immeasurably better under English domination than she was when under Egyptian. And the colonies in America which have stood the test of time are not the French colonies, not the Spanish colonies, but the English colonies. She is two nations, and you can trace the double current all through her history. She is the England of William the Conqueror, the freebooter of the olden time, and she is the England of Harold, the sainted King and martyred King of England. She is the England of Henry III., the would-be oppressor, and she is the England of Simon de Montfort, the organizer and founder of the British House of Commons, and the father of the American House of Representatives. She is the England of Bloody Mary and Cardinal Pole, and she is the England of Cranmer and Queen Elizabeth. She is the England of Charles I. and Archbishop Laud, and she is the England of Cromwell and the Puritans. She is the England of George III., who sought to override the colonies, and she is no less

the England of the Earl of Chatham and of Edmund Burke, who with courageous statesmanship—would God we could see such also to-day in the American Congress!—dared stand almost alone for the rights of a people outside his land, and against popular prejudice. [Applause.] She is the England—may I not say it?—of Lord Salisbury, and also the England of William Ewart Gladstone. [Applause.]

A few years ago you called in Plymouth Church an Englishman to your pulpit, and to-day I got a telegram from him. "Queen Street, Wolverhampton"—that is the name of his church—"Queen Street sends greeting and prays for perfect concord between England and America. Berry." Do you suppose that is the only church in England that is praying for concord between England and America? The England of Simon de Montfort, the England of Queen Elizabeth, the England of Cromwell, the England of Edmund Burke, the England of William Ewart Gladstone is to-night in its churches praying for peace and concord between England and America, and are we to go to these men and to these women on their knees and say, "Get off your knees, and come on and do us battle"?

A war with England is like a civil war. We are of the same blood; we are of the same kin; we are of the same essential constitution; we are of the same spiritual faith; we have the same history; we are knitted together by a thousand ties, more sacred than the ties of commerce and trade that unite us. Who is there in this congregation that has not some friend to-day, or some ancestor in the past, on English soil? England, what have we not received from her? She has fought our battles for us; she has poured out her blood for us. It was England that gave English-speaking people the Magna Charta, without which American free institutions never could have been: it was England that founded the House of Commons, without which the House of Representatives would have been impossible; it was England that established the Constitutions of Clarendon, without which religious liberty would have been unknown upon this continent; it was England that fought and bled for a free press, free education, a free voice, a free nation. There is feudalism still remaining in England. It is sometimes brutal, sometimes bullying, sometimes bragging. Are we to imitate England, and be brutal and bullying and bragging also? God forbid. It is a time for us to reach out, not the clenched fist against this double England, but the open palm to the England of Simon de Montfort, and the England of Queen Elizabeth, and the England of Cromwell, and the England of Gladstone. I join hands with Puritan England for the conquest of the world—not by war, not by armed men—but by ideas, truth, rectitude, honor, national progress. Together, England and America may enwrap the world with liberty and fill it with peace. (Applause.) * * *

Our glory is the glory of a land of peace. Our Nation is a confederacy of nations themselves united in the bonds of peace. Our prosperity is due to a hundred years of almost uninterrupted peace, and it is impossible to think, as this Christmas-tide goes by, that this strange passion, this unreasoning ebullition, this horrible wrath will not abate.

I hope if I had been quite alone I should have courage enough to say what I think on this subject. But it is a great deal easier not to be quite alone—and I am not. And I have been speaking to-night—not by any authority—yet

really for Plymouth Church, that has not feared war when war was demanded by honor, but will not accept war if peace can be maintained with honor. And I believe I am speaking for the Christian church from ocean to ocean, and I pray God that thousands of ministers are speaking to-night as I am speaking. And I am speaking for business men, who do not speak, but want others to voice their sentiments for them. And I am speaking for mothers whose hearts beat quick with horror at the thought of a broken household, and the boy marching off to battle. Let us have peace. (Applause.)

THE TRUE MISSION OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

BY REV. REUEN THOMAS, D.D.

From an address delivered before the Congregational Club of Chicago, Feb. 17.

There has been a tendency in all limited monarchies, England only excepted, to turn into absolute monarchies. Of all monarchies, there is none so simply ornamental as the English monarchy, and none so unconsciously influential. I apprehend that in our day the wish for republicanism in England is confined to a few doctrinaires. The majestic figurehead of a ship has scarcely less control over the rudder than has an English sovereign over English politics and administrative government. England is today a monarchical republic.

It is necessary to recognize that there are and always have been two streams of tendency, two ideas of nationality in England, fundamentally one, when the very greatest causes have been at issue, but ordinarily in no very friendly attitude toward each other. They are represented sufficiently well for our purpose by the words Tory and Liberal. The Tory party is the party of privilege. Its worst expression is an hereditary House of Lords—not elected, not amenable to the people—blocking the way of legislation when it is safe to do it, and except in some of its most intelligent and distinguished members, entirely devoid of popular sympathies. The Liberal party represents all that is most humane and progressive in English life. In judging of English speech and English life it is always necessary to distinguish between the English people and English Toryism. Unfortunately, English Toryism, led by its most insolent and aristocratic representative, the man who represents more than any other man the jingoism of England, is now in power. With a majority at his back which is too large for the comfort or happiness of those who, like myself, have no confidence in Tory government, this man is yet amenable to the English people, who, in case of threatened disaster, would summarily call him to order, either by direct appeal to the crown, or by insisting on a direct appeal to the country. You would not be interested in anything of detail as to the causes which defeated the Liberals and put the present Tory government into power. But it is necessary, in order to an appreciation of that which follows, that I should ask you to remember that with all England's love of freedom and moral order, and with all its tendency to enterprise and action, Toryism is a reactionary force in English life, and does not represent the best thought and feeling of the English people.

To that Liberal party in the English nation all America is more closely allied, both by blood-relationship, by popular sympathies, by ideas and affections, by literature, by religion, by modes and methods of government and

by the ideals which control our life than to any other people of the world. And if it should be said in reply that this America of ours is far too composite to allow of so sweeping a statement as that being admitted without debate, the facts which justify that statement are not far to seek. That Liberal party in England which has got itself into historical expression represents a similar party in every country of Europe. The difference between that party in England and the same party in other European countries is in this: that owing to influences which have been at work in England since as far back as 1165, when on English soil 30 weavers in the diocese of Worcester were summoned before the council of Oxford and asked what they meant by saying that they were Christians and revered the teachings of the Apostles, they "were scourged and branded as heretics and then driven out of the city to perish in the winter's cold," from that time forth we find here and there the manifestation of that spirit of independent inquiry and of energetic freedom which sought ever to realize a higher life, showing itself now in William of Occam in the end of the 13th century, now in the poetry of Chaucer, now in the brave and learned John Wickliffe of Lutterworth, the seeds of whose broad sowing were scattered even in Germany, and grew into the reformation; now more manifestly in those men who sought a temporary asylum in Holland and came here, after learning something there, to be celebrated by us as the Pilgrim Fathers, the founders of our New England life and inferentially our American constitution.

These men represent similar men in France and in Germany, in Austria and in Italy. In Germany, that for which the English Liberal party has always stood, focussed itself in Luther and broke out into the reformation. In France it was illustrated in the Huguenots. In Italy in those Protestant peoples in the valleys of Piedmont. In Austria in Huss and his followers. In England that spirit succeeded in winning for itself the right to be, and from that day to this has confronted Toryism with more or less of successful endeavor, standing for religious liberty and for political enfranchisement.

In Germany it has given us all that is most forceful and hopeful in that land of philosophical, scientific and literary criticism. Yet in Germany that spirit has never had the freedom and power which it has had in England.

In France it was ruthlessly suppressed, and the purest and most valorous blood in France was dried up and made all but unproductive, so far as France herself was concerned. The hugest blunder France ever made in all her history was the massacre and scattering of the Huguenots. The religious liberalism of Southern Europe has been persecuted to the death; yet it still lives, and is not ashamed of itself. It is out of sight but still lives.

We hear very little of those peoples, as liberal in their feelings and ideas as ourselves, who hide away in the valleys of Piedmont and other valleys of northern Italy, but they represent that which is represented by English Liberalism in this day and in all days—by the Huguenot ideas and feelings, reviving once again in France—by the Lutheranism of Germany, not so free as it ought to be—represented most fully and conspicuously in the world today by the freedom, the aspirations, the struggle, the activity, the idealism of the United States. I say most fully and conspicuously. We must not forget however, that the English Liberalism, in religion and in politics, whose ideas and aspirations we have inherited